THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVII JUNE, 1944 No. 288

Editorial

THE announcement that Dr Lowther Clarke will cease to be Editorial Secretary of S.P.C.K. at the end of this year cannot be passed over in THEOLOGY. He has been intimately associated with the work of this journal ever since its inception, and he has been one of its most regular and most appreciated contributors. No one can estimate how much he has done behind the scenes. He has relieved the Editors of an immense amount of routine work, and has always been ready to give them the benefit of his advice, though never anxious to force it upon them or to restrict their freedom. The Dean of Exeter, in his farewell remarks as Editor, said that "the Editorial Secretary of S.P.C.K. is probably the most useful servant that the Church of England possesses in this generation." That is no more than the simple truth, although comparatively few people can be aware of it on account of Dr Lowther Clarke's self-preservation from publicity.

We hope, however, that it will be long before we have to write "Finis" to his association with THEOLOGY, and that for many years yet we shall be able to publish contributions from his pen. His literary productions, both learned and popular, both acknowledged and anonymous, have been not the least astonishing of his achievements, when it is remembered that he has been immersed in business affairs all the week and in pastoral work on Sundays; they put to shame many theologians, who cannot be more busy and who are certainly less productive. We are sure that his richly stored and fertile mind has still much to render up for the benefit of the whole Church and of Anglican divinity in particular.

The appointment of the Rev. F. Noel Davey as the new Editorial Secretary of S.P.C.K. is extremely welcome. He can be assured of the best wishes of the readers, as well as of the Editor, of THEOLOGY in a task which is likely to prove of gathering importance for the Church of England.

* * * *

The article on "Confessional Theology and the Anglican Church" by Mr Jacques, which was published in the March number, has, as our correspondence shows, aroused considerable interest. It raised a question of great importance, which will have to be pursued. The question as to the distinctive witness of Anglican theology has at least three bearings. First, it is observed that the Churches on the Continent have been impelled to make a fresh confession of their faith in order to distinguish the demands of the Gospel from those of new ideologies. It is a pertinent question whether a new ideology is taking shape in Britain from which the Church ought clearly to distinguish its witness.

We shall have something to say about this next month. Secondly, it is observed that in other communions, both in Britain and abroad, there is a present tendency to rediscover and reinterpret the distinctive witness of their standard formularies and divines. Neo-Thomism, Neo-Calvinism, etc., are the order of the day. The Westminster Confession is being studied again, and a relevance is being claimed for it which everyone supposed had been lost for ever. In interdenominational discussions Anglicans find themselves confronted by theologians who speak out of a definite and coherent tradition, and they wonder whether they ought not to be able to do so too. Hence the quest for a confessional Anglican theology arises in part from a desire to distinguish an Anglican system of doctrine from other confessional systems. Thirdly, there is the question whether the Church of England is any longer capable of making a single, distinctive witness. In the seventeenth century, it may be granted, and even until the nineteenth, the Church of England stood for a common faith and a consistent tradition, which was acknowledged, with whatever differences of emphasis, by all its members. But it may be asked whether in the twentieth century the differences between parties, schools of thought, etc., have not had such a disintegrating effect that the Church of England as a whole is no longer capable of making a common and distinctive witness.

There are thus three questions which, however much related, ought to be recognized as distinct. What is the confession of the Church of England with regard to (*a*) the non-Christian or pseudo-Christian ideologies that are at loose in the world, (*b*) the distinctive doctrinal systems of other Christian communions, and (*c*) the distinctive claims of the various groups and sections which it contains?

Let the People Pray

FOUR HUNDRED YEARS OF LITANY

The frontispiece of Bishop Anthony Sparrow's *A Rationale or Practical Exposition of the Book of Common Prayer* (1722) is symbolic. It portrays Thomas Cranmer presiding at a round-table conference of Bishops and Doctors, "Compilers of the English Liturgy," with three books laid open before him—the Liturgies, the Bible, and the Fathers. The English Litany "wherein the people are more exercised than in any other part of the Service"[1] was the firstfruits of this liturgical harvesting. On June 11, 1544, the Feast of St Barnabas, at the king's command, were first heard in a tongue understood of the people the familiar Invocations and Deprecations, Obsecrations and Petitions, which have played such a significant part in the moulding of the spirit and ethos of Anglicanism through four hundred years.[2]

[1] Anthony Sparrow, *op. cit.*

[2] English versions of Latin Litanies dated from the ninth century, but were probably private prayers. (Mabillon.)

The Litany is the people's service, first sung in times of urgency—there were excessive rains in England in 1543, two wars were raging in 1544. In subsequent years the people have expressed themselves through lengthy response and ejaculatory prayer in varying mood. In palmy days of peace and plenty such urgent supplication has been despised as tedious, panicky, and masochistic. Designed for all classes, it is severely hierarchical in tone; the king, nobility and commonalty are here arrayed in due rank and order. Yet all without distinction are "miserable sinners"; every petition is "shut up in that ever-acceptable prayer of our Lord,"[1] the levelling, family prayer; finally the priest, "where he hath a proper part,"[2] offers the petitions of the people, as was done in the ancient Liturgies, in the Collect, the sum or compendium of all that the people had prayed for, recited aloud behind the pulpit.

The words "miserable sinners" have made the Litany heartily disliked. It is true that they appear as a somewhat florid translation of the ancient "miserere," but the point remains that the Anglo-Saxon makes outward objection to the word "miserable" and is inwardly recalcitrant against the term "sinners." The Litany takes sin seriously; its tone is strongly and realistically penitential, for it contains not merely petition but Christian petition. In the ordinary sense of the word, it cannot be called popular, but it is common, corporate prayer for people who both recognize the individual's responsibility for the sin of the world and discern the social significance of all sin. When sin is ignored or remains undiagnosed, Litanies assume a new function. The miserable sinner becomes the Happy Warrior. The people who pray do not in penitence declare repeatedly their dependence upon God and their poverty when bereft of His grace, but they come to God with adventures and pioneer-work already nobly started and ask for His blessing to crown their heroic achievement.[3] We shall rue the day on which the Church's Litany ceases to acknowledge the people's plight and turns to furbish their self-reliance. In Cranmer's Litany the appeal for the faithful in so sore a case is made not to aspirations, high ideals, patriotic sentiment, or even to the saints, but to the strong name of the Trinity.

It is a service for the nave rather than the sanctuary. As in the days of the prophet Joel (ii, 17) the cry "Spare thy people" went up "between the porch and the altar," so today the Litany is offered by the minister in the name and with the co-operation of the people at a faldstool before the chancel door. The Prayer Book of 1559 speaks of "the Priest and the Quire, kneeling in the midst of the church."[4] The bell was tolled for Litany between Matins and the Communion service, and one out of every family was bidden to be present.[5] The irregular recital of the Litany by laymen was declared unjustifiable, and condemned as a practice against the express rules of our Church,

---

[1] T. Bisse, *The Beauty of Holiness* (1716).
[2] Thorndyke, *Religious Assemblies*.
[3] See S. Morison: *English Prayer Books*, p. 123; "Litany for Airmen."
[4] Eliz. Inj., 18.
[5] Bishop Andrewes, *Notes upon the Liturgy*.

which crept in partly through the indevout laziness of minor canons. Very often young boys of eighteen or nineteen years of age had been left in charge; "one would think," writes Thomas Bennet, "when the nation swarms with such as ridicule, oppose, and deny the distinction of Clergy and Laity, that those should be ashamed; it is a flat contradiction of all primitive order."[1]

The connexion between Litanies and Rogationtide Processions has never been indisputably clarified. A decree of the Council of Cologne ordered that Litanies should be, for the future, only within the walls of the church. This finds support in the Injunctions of Elizabeth, which state: "The people shall once in the year, at the time accustomed, with the curate and the substantial men of the parish, walk about the parishes as they were accustomed, and at their return to the church make their common prayers." Hence, perhaps, the strange zeugma which described the people, litany-wise, making a solemn procession on their knees. The scene in St Paul's Cathedral on November 24, 1588, the day of Public Thanksgiving for the defeat of the Spaniards, further illustrates the outwardness and inwardness of this common prayer: "The companies of the cittie in their liveries stoode in their rayles of timber, covered with blue cloth, all of them saluting her Highnesse as she proceeded along to Paules church, where at the great west door, shee dismounting from her chariot throne between the hours of 12 and 1 was received by the Bishop of London, the Dean of St Paul's and others of the clergie, to the number of more than 50, all in rich coapes, where her Highnesse on her knees made her heartie prayers unto God; which prayers being finished, shee was, under a rich canapie, brought through the long west isle to her travers in the quire, the clergy singing the Letanie."

In patristic days the Litanies appeared as extemporaneous prayer; they were sung in procession as a counterblast to the popular choruses of Arian propaganda. In Celtic liturgical custom, they were the product of private devotion, recited in solitude, imploring the assistance of saints rather than deploring the plight of sinners: "a besom of devotion, a summons to saints, an entreaty to angels, a breastplate to my soul;"[2] Cranmer, with the recent translation "by a judicious hand"[3] of the Germanic Litany of Hermann of Cologne before him, wove many of the features of liturgies, Eastern and Western, into the well-balanced, rhythmical, carefully-vowellated Anglican Litany. There are undoubtedly omissions and defects in his composition. At first there was no mention of the Church's missionary work in the Intercessions; in the Deprecations there is still no reference to the sin of avarice. The Germanic custom[4] of demanding the recital of the Litany on Wednesdays, Fridays, and Sundays might reasonably be criticized as exacting too solid and earnest a penitence from the faithful, leaving them bereft of stronger and more urgent prayers in the day of special emergency. The closing section adds fervour to prayer in wartime or in the bloody days of Reformation, but the

[1] T. Bennet, *Paraphrase on B.C.P.* (1708).
[2] C. Plummer, *Irish Litanies*, H.B.S., lxii.
[3] W. Nichols, *Commentary on B.C.P.* (1712).
[4] Göttingen Order, 1542.

people might justly be excused if they find it difficult to sustain the note of panic and persecution three times a week through years of peace and war.

In his compilation, Cranmer was at his best when interweaving worship and doctrine. By uniting the privileges with the obligations of faith in Jesus Christ, he gave us in the Litany a vehicle of worship, characteristic of a Church Catholic and Reformed, which never stales nor becomes threadbare. The opening invocations, with explicit, well-defined appeal to the Trinity, framed in Athanasian language, lend objectivity and permanence in the form of adoration to the exercises of self-abasement and despair which are to follow.

The litaneutical form was used in the early days of the Church in schools of prayer. The deacon directed people "from point to point"[1] what to pray for, and the people, instead of saying *Amen*, replied *Domine, miserere* in the manner of the antiphonal singing of the psalms. Thus the prayers in the Litany are not simply made in the name of the people "through Jesus Christ our Lord," "for what is said separately by minister and people does jointly make up but one and the same sentence, and if that sentence be a prayer then doubtless they both equally pray. Conversely, the people are so far from praying alone without the minister, that unless what he saith be joined to their additions, they pray not at all." The Puritans, with their fine disregard for liturgical movement, adhered to the long prayer of the minister, and, in their anxiety to eliminate the people's response, condemned the insistence of ejaculatory prayer, and cast aside a Litany which to them was nothing more than "a fardel of tautology and battology."[2] To a lover of common prayer there was grace in the very repetition: "How we do in a manner take heaven by force."[3]

The lengthened shadow of a man stretches over the Litany and Suffrages—"in all time of our tribulation, in all time of our wealth." Here is realism about our sorry plight. We are all caught in the toils of human history: "Remember not, Lord, our offences, nor the offences of our forefathers." We are beset by personal sin, " pride, vain glory . . . fornication," and the sins of society, " false doctrine and heresy . . . sedition and privy conspiracy "; our needs are political, social, economic, international, spiritual, material: "That it may please thee to keep thy servant our King . . . to bless and keep all thy people . . . to give and preserve to our use the kindly fruits of the earth . . . to give to all nations unity, peace, and concord . . . to give to all thy people increase of grace to hear meekly thy word . . . to defend and provide for the fatherless children. . . ."

Over the complexities of this picture of human striving falls the lengthened shadow of the God-Man, called first "Son of God," then "O Lamb of God," who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven. In the Litany are listed the fifteen mysteries of His manifestation in the flesh and justification in the spirit.[4] In these obse-

[1] *Clem. Const.*, VIII, 5, 6, 10. *Cf. Apostol. Con.*, VIII, 6.
[2] Quoted by F. P. Pocock (1842).
[3] T. Bisse, *op. cit.*
[4] *Cf.* Lancelot Andrewes, *op. cit.*

cratory prayers the acts and sufferings of the God-Man are pleaded. The Litany tells of both humanity uprooted and integrated humanism, the illness and the remedy. In this document lies evidence of the tragedy of human existence and the vision beyond the tragedy.

GEORGE SIMMS.

TRINITY COLLEGE,
DUBLIN.

Good or Great Bishops?[1]

"THE general weight of work in the church lieth on men of middle and moderate parts. That servant who improved his two talents into four, did more than the other who increased his five into ten." The observation of Thomas Fuller is true of the episcopate no less than of the inferior clergy. And one of the doubts felt concerning the elevation of Dr Henson to the episcopate was whether, being admittedly a man of unusual gifts, he would accommodate himself happily to the oversight of clergy who were predominantly men of two (or even one) talents and would work harmoniously with those of his episcopal brethren similarly endowed. Particularly was this consideration important in Hereford, where the tradition of clerical life was rather *quieta non movere* (the *Church Times* permitting itself the uncomplimentary reference to it as the Dead See), and also in Durham, where Bishop Moule had allowed his heart to run away with his head in the matter of laying hands suddenly on aspirants to the priesthood. Nor was it less influential in regard to Dr Henson's relations with his brethren of the upper houses of convocation and at Lambeth (some of whom had publicly opposed his elevation to the bench), and in the wider assembly at the Lambeth Conferences of 1920 and 1930, where as fourth prelate of the English hierarchy and by virtue of his personal parts he could hardly fail to possess potentialities of considerable influence. Upon the answers to these obstinate questionings will depend the verdict alike of contemporaries and of posterity upon Dr Henson's episcopate; and so far as contemporaries are concerned it is unlikely that any fuller corpus of evidence will be afforded than the second volume of the bishop's *Retrospect*. The former volume had depicted the stormy petrel of the inferior clergy, the staunch individualist and independent preacher and writer. Many of its readers must have voiced the question whether elevation to the episcopate would convert Dr Henson into a conformist, a good member of the episcopal college, and would extinguish his independence of thought and action. Not a few contemporaries appeared to have concluded from the testimony of his outward acts (such, for example, as his part in the Liverpool Cathedral dispute and the unwonted and unpredictable spectacle of his appearance before an applauding Anglo-Catholic audience to join hands—but not hearts—in denouncing the Establishment and demanding spiritual independence), that he had indeed suffered a sea change into

[1] *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, vol. ii, 1920-39. By H. Hensley Henson. Oxford University Press. 21s. 1943.

something rare and strange. The perusal of this present volume enables an answer to be made to these questions, though doubtless different readers will offer diverse replies.

At the outset it must be said that Dr Henson remains the same in the fundamental characteristics of his personality. The fearless denunciation of the Putumayo atrocities is paralleled by the eloquent orator who, in the House of Lords, pilloried the policy of the British Government towards the Italian rape of Abyssinia. The presbyter who had refused to seek a short cut to the solution of pressing social problems by iteration of shibboleths became the bishop of a diocese tragically scarred by protracted unemployment, who refused still to proclaim short and easy ways of curing unemployment which seemed to his judgment as fallacious as popular, whilst realizing with increasing sadness the deterioration of physique and character alike, produced by the *débâcle* of the Durham coal industry. Indeed it may be said that nothing will redound more to Dr Henson's credit than the speech on Abyssinia or the penultimate chapter of this present volume on unemployment, both characterized by penetrating sympathy with the victims. The champion of friendly relations with Protestant non-episcopal churches at home and in Europe, though perhaps less familiar in non-Anglican pulpits as bishop than as presbyter, remained constant in principle, as his visit to Sweden in 1920 and his share in the Lambeth Conferences of 1920 and 1930 attest. The chief ground for the charge of inconsistency lies in his attitude towards the Establishment, and this demands separate consideration. But the general impression is of the same character on a wider stage.

The present volume is packed full with topics of absorbing interest, and suggests that the author has found the problem of selection one of great difficulty. Some chapters are so slight that they might have been omitted to make room for more detailed treatment of other themes (such, for example, are the chapters on George V and Windsor and the two chapters headed " Gifford Lectures"). Perhaps the chief snare for the reviewer lies in the variety of matters inviting comment; and even when the most rigid exercise of economy has been made there remain more topics than space permits to be mentioned. One of the most welcome chapters to the present reader is that recounting Dr Henson's Swedish visit in 1920, sprinkled as it is with wise historical saws and modern instances. A great deal may be learnt from this chapter concerning the place of the Church of England in Christendom. More would have been gladly welcomed in illustration of Dr Henson's diocesan administration, especially in his dealings with ordinands, questions of preferment, and the nature of the office and work of a bishop in this century (and how many examining chaplains must regard as a paragon among bishops one who writes that "the report of the examining chaplains was final with me, I would not go behind it"!?) Two chapters in a total of thirty-five seem scant justice to that episcopal administration which must constitute the ground for approval or the reverse of Dr Henson's episcopate in its pastoral character. Sufficient is recorded to convince the present reader that the author was a good bishop, honest, painstaking, sympathetic and

just in his diocesan oversight, and that the verdict of Durham at his retirement expressed in "affectionate gratitude for a great and generous episcopate" will stand the test of time. In this regard the Prime Ministers responsible for the successive stages of Dr Henson's promotion must be adjudged right against prelates and primate who were opposed or doubtful.

Dr Henson belongs to the traditional Anglican school which regards the episcopal office as having a national as well as an ecclesiastical character, and as enjoying a certain political position. Accordingly, he was opposed to the vogue of "little bishoprics" which has been one of the outstanding features of the ecclesiastical reforms of the Church Assembly and the result of which has been the reduction of the historic diocese of Winchester to a shadow, and the creation of redundant small sees at Portsmouth and Guildford as well as in other parts of England. Against a project for dismembering the see of Hereford by the formation of a Shropshire bishopric Dr Henson contended stoutly, sincerely and successfully; for there can be little doubt that his speech in the House of Lords turned the scale against the measure. Upon this vexed question of large or small dioceses opinion is sharply divided (though probably financial straits after the second world war of this century will deliver the Church from this dissipation of time and energy for some time to come); and each reader can express only his individual opinion. It can hardly be a good thing for a Church that it should develop the governess-conception of the episcopate, however; and two stubborn facts confront the advocates of more and smaller bishoprics—namely, the decline in lay-membership contemporaneous with a large increase of diocesan and suffragan sees, and the insufficiency of clergy of capacity to undertake episcopal office, a fact which Archbishop Lang observed, lamenting to Henson "the absence of suitable men, a fact on which the Prime Minister does not omit to comment." In these circumstances a halt might well be called, or even a reversal of the vogue of the last two decades inaugurated. Moreover, Dr Henson, at Durham, endeavoured to cultivate the wider conception of episcopal office by maintaining friendly relations with the leading county and municipal officials, with Freemasons and with Rotarians. His acute and critical observance of the two Lambeth Conferences which he attended fortified his judgment. In 1930 he noted that

> a striking feature of this Conference to those who know the previous history of the persons concerned, is the solidarity created by their academic experience. Lang, Palmer, and Temple are Balliol men, Lang and Headlam have been All Souls Fellows, Headlam as regius professor of theology had been the official chief and colleague of Temple. It is ever the sway of unperceived and unacknowledged personal forces which determines the courses of public affairs. . . . The Indian bishops have made a good impression. . . . I am not so well impressed by the Australian and Canadian bishops. . . . South Africa is well represented, and if the South African bishops were not such very narrow Anglo-Catholics they would count well. . . . The two Irish archbishops have done well, but the Scottish bishops count for nothing; and the bishops from Wales have hardly uttered a word. Mainly the business of the Conference has been in the hands of the English bishops. Has this prominence any connexion with the Establishment?

The same factor of the influence of personal distinction was noted by Dr Henson in regard to Bishop Barnes. "It is a remarkable indication of the involuntary homage paid to intellectual distinction that, in spite of the resentments which he certainly provokes, he commands the respectful if reluctant attention of the Assembly." It is possible, of course, to disagree with many of Dr Henson's judgments; but care should be taken not to draw the wrong conclusion. The author's own career provides invaluable warning against the danger that independence of outlook may constitute a barrier to elevation to the episcopate, to the severe detriment of the Church.

There remains the episode which "traversed the whole cycle of sincere tergiversation" for Dr Henson, his resolute advocacy of disestablishment after the rejection of the revised Prayer Book by the House of Commons. Since this was the most remarkable incident of his episcopal career it demands more extended consideration. Somewhat to the surprise, and much to the relief, of Archbishop Davidson, Henson had cordially agreed to the revision, including the controversial matters of the alternative Communion Office, the permissive authorization of vestments, and the reservation of the consecrated elements for Communion of the Sick. Equally to the primate's surprise, and much to his chagrin, when the proposals were defeated in the House of Commons Henson declared himself a convert to disestablishment. With great frankness he has set forth the grounds of his conviction, and has not sought to minimize the arguments against his position. It is evident that he had been increasingly anxious about a possible conflict between Church and State in view of the rise of the Labour Party to the position of official Parliamentary opposition; and that this apprehension made him more ready to seize upon the Prayer Book episode as a *casus belli*:

> The rise to power of "Labour" has introduced a new and most menacing factor to the whole question of Establishment, for "Labour" does not respect the conventions or accept the principles which are implicit in the existing relations of Church and State.

Again:

> Would it not be better for the Church to insist on clearing up the principles of its establishment here and now, when clear spiritual issues have been raised, than to wait the advent of a "Labour" Government, when the conflict with the State would probably break out over some intolerable abuse of the Crown patronage?

It would appear that Dr Henson, convinced on political grounds that the Establishment was nearing its end, sought a plausible ecclesiastical issue on which to anticipate the inevitable. But was the Prayer Book episode such an issue? His own statements go far to argue the contrary. From the outset he felt the work of revision to be shadowed by "an uncomfortable feeling of unreality and misgiving"; and he is free from doubt about the attitude of the laity:

> In this connexion, the Church is almost equivalent to the clergy. For even the laity who are on the electoral roll are, for the most part, Erastianly-minded

Protestants, who would welcome an accommodation with the House of Commons, with whose action they sympathize. It is remarkable that hardly a flicker of resentment is apparent among the Anglican laity.

Again, he allows that

it cannot be fairly denied that there was very little genuine desire for the Revised Prayer Book, and very little sincere regret at its rejection. There is a great volume of accumulated exasperation against the "Anglo-Catholics," which predisposes even moderate Anglicans to acquiesce easily in anything that may be regarded as a defeat of *their* hopes. Accordingly, there is more indignation at the muddle into which the action of the House of Commons has brought the Church than any genuine resentment at the humiliation inflicted on the spiritual society.

It would almost seem that in this particular instance the Church was equivalent only to the bishops; and Dr Henson comes very near to saying this outright:

If we had behind us a genuinely united Church, our course would be comparatively simple, but the Revised Prayer Book is a most delicately-balanced compromise, and any alteration so disturbs the balance that the whole structure may collapse. Our brave front in the House of Lords was largely a piece of inevitable bluff. We assumed an agreement which we could not but know does not exist, and when we are required to produce it, the chances are heavy against our being able to do so.

There the matter may be left; for Dr Henson supplies a sufficient refutation of the argument that the Prayer Book was a good *casus belli* for a break with the State. But the incident was decisive in his personal history. Possibly it cost him the chance of the northern primacy in 1928. It is clear that the Archbishopric of York attracted him in some respects; it is certain that he would have welcomed the offer, whatever his reply. But, as he himself observes, he had nailed his colours to the Revised Prayer Book and preferred to go down with that ship than to change course.

From the perusal of this second volume of the *Retrospect* several lessons may usefully be drawn. First is the importance of the representation on the episcopal bench of the cross-bench mind. A dangerous tendency is noticeable to promote divines who are either leaders of some school of ecclesiastical churchmanship in the hope that the policy supported by them will carry the confidence of their followers and thereby ease the problem of discipline, or who are safe middle-men, ready to swim with the current of contemporary ecclesiastical statesmanship. Dr Henson's episcopate shows the influence and value of an independent mind. For he never commanded the consistent allegiance of any Church party. His elevation seemed to divide him from his Modernist friends (witness the almost invariably unfavourable nature of his references to Streeter) without gaining any compensating allies. The Evangelicals he mortally affronted by the phrase "the Protestant underworld" and by his attack on party patronage trusts. The mild *rapprochement* with Anglo-Catholics following his renunciation of the Establishment was too slight to endure, and Dr Henson betrays a continuous sense of embarrassment during its brief honeymoon. But

this freedom from ecclesiastical parties gave to his words, both spoken and written, the authority which comes from individual conviction; and from this characteristic flowed the influence which he enjoyed. Secondly, his episcopate at Durham (for his tenure of the see of Hereford was too brief to enable him to make much impression though long enough to efface the prejudices unscrupulously raised before his consecration) illustrates the potentialities still latent in the office and work of a bishop when fulfilled by a prelate of intellectual distinction, indefatigable industry, and integrity of purpose. Thirdly, Dr Henson makes clear the danger, resulting from the centralization of administration in London since the creation of the Church Assembly, of the virtual exclusion of the northern province, save perhaps for its primate, from the central counsels of the Church. In an episcopal church it is evident that much depends upon the calibre of the episcopate; and Dr Henson's volume provides much valuable evidence both positive and negative in this regard.

And so the reader must take leave of his author. Dr Henson has written a revealing, frank, and sincere autobiography. It is nothing if not honest, and never tedious. If his pen is pungent at times, it is not less so towards himself than to others; and his austere standards are a valuable corrective to the sentimentalism which too often pervades episcopal utterances. He has been an outstanding preacher in his age, and a fearless speaker and prophet in the affairs both of Church and State. Our review of his first volume began with the remark of Edward FitzGerald upon hearing of the promotion of his former tutor, Connop Thirlwall, to the episcopate: "Good people here are much scandalized at Thirlwall's being made a bishop. . . . I do not think, however, that I would have made him bishop: I am all for good and not great bishops"; and its bearing upon the circumstances attending Dr Henson's nomination to Hereford. It may therefore be said, unequivocally, that the *Retrospect* has supplied its own convincing answer to the doubts ventilated in 1918. Dr Henson proved to be a good bishop, and withal a great bishop also. A good bishop may not be also great. It is clear that in this case a great bishop was also a good bishop. Above all, as his writings abundantly prove, Dr Henson understood and loved the *Anglicana Ecclesia*: "Such the depth of his learning that his pen was a better bucket than his tongue to draw it out; a great defender both by preaching and writing of the discipline of the Church of England."

Norman Sykes.

Oxford.

Studies in Texts

Blessed are the meek (πραεῖς)*: for they shall inherit the earth.*—St Matt. v, 5.

I have been asked to comment on a statement in Gerald Heard's *Training for the Life of the Spirit*, p. 6:

"Training, therefore, is popular to-day. It needs little commendation if the method really works. 'The trained' (for that is the real meaning

of the word translated in the New Testament as 'the meek') 'inherit the earth.' "

We all know the interpretation which makes out that the early Christians exalted meekness because they had to make a virtue out of necessity and so started the characteristic "slave-virtues" of Christianity, one which has a measure of plausibility; but this is new to me. I can only suppose that it is based on the meanings given by the lexicons of classical Greek, πρᾶος being the word for a "tame" animal and πραΰνω meaning "tame." If so, the fallacy lies in the difference between animals and men: Mr Heard is thinking of self-training, whereas animals are trained or tamed by their masters.

But the linguistic usage of Jewish writers of Greek books in the first century must be interpreted by Hebrew standards, not those of classical Greek, and chiefly by the Septuagint. The Beatitude in question is a quotation from Psalm xxxvii, 11: "The meek shall inherit the land." On the lips of Christ, and in its setting, it evidently refers to the regenerated world of the Messianic age, which will belong to the meek. The thought is so like that of verse 3, "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," that verse 5 has been considered a doublet of it. The point we are considering is the exact meaning of "meek," which can be decided only from its use in the Bible. Aristotle's definition (*Ethics* iv, 11) has only a remote bearing, for it has no suggestion of an attitude of the soul to God, such as is necessarily implicit in the biblical meaning: "Meekness (or better, here, gentleness, πραότης) is a mean state in respect of angry feelings . . . a good-tempered or gentle person is inclined to forgiveness rather than to revenge."

In the passages to be quoted "meek" and "meekness" in every case represent the Greek πραΰς and πραότης, of the Septuagint and the New Testament, and in the Old Testament the Hebrew *'āni*, *'ānāw* and *'ānāh*, *'anwāh*. The meaning is fixed by the earliest occurrence, Num. xii, 3: "The man Moses was very meek." Aaron and Miriam complain that Moses has married a Cushite woman. Has the Lord spoken only to Moses? "The man Moses was very meek." Then the Lord intervenes. The point is that Moses does not assert himself, but leaves his vindication to God. In no subsequent passage is this root-meaning deserted. The word occurs fairly frequently in the Psalms—xxv, 9: "the meek shall he guide in judgement"; xxxiv, 2: "the meek shall hear thereof and be glad"; xxxvii, 11: "the meek shall inherit the land"; xlv, 4: "in thy majesty ride on prosperously, because of truth and righteousness and judgement"; xlvii, 6: "the Lord upholdeth the meek"; cxlix, 4: "the Lord . . . will beautify the meek with salvation." In all these passages the reference is to the *'anāwim*, the poor pious folk of the post-exilic period, who eschewed political agitation and served God in quietness, nourishing an increasingly definite Messianic hope. From this class, neither Pharisees nor Sadducees nor zealots, the first disciples of Jesus were drawn. The Beatitudes are not a complete mirror of the Christian life; they are rather the ratification by Jesus of the ideals of the *'anāwim*. They might degenerate into ignoble passivity; in so far as they prove complete trust in God, they are the indispensable

passport to the Kingdom. The other Old Testament passage is Zech. ix, 9: "Thy king cometh unto thee . . . meek, and riding upon an ass." The exact significance of "meek" is not clear, for the passage is based on the prediction of Gen. xlix, 11. There are several occurrences in Ecclesiasticus: i, 27; iii, 17; iv, 8; x, 28; and xlv, 4. The last refers to Moses, who "sanctified his soul in faithfulness and meekness" (*cf.* Num. xii, 3).

In the New Testament we have Matt. xi, 29: "I am meek and lowly of heart." Absence of self-assertion is compatible with personal dignity, but on the lips of Jesus the sense must be theological, of His attitude towards the Father. Matt. xxi, 5 is a quotation of Zech. ix, 9. The remaining passage is 2 Cor. x, 1: "I beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ," which seems to point to a knowledge, on the part of writer and readers, of Matt. xi, 29.

The "meek," therefore, in the Bible, is one who humbly commits his cause to God, knowing that vindication is certain, and meanwhile bears undeserved adversity patiently.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

CORRESPONDENCE

TRAINING FOR THE MINISTRY

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Both in the general practice of the Church of England and in the Report on Training for the Ministry one witness to a Candidate's character is neglected—namely, his congregation. I would urge that no man be accepted for training without a congregation's recommendation. For the sake of brevity I confine myself to three points: (*a*) If the principle be accepted that the laity ought to have a voice in the selection of Candidates, it is surely important that this voice be that of an actual worshipping community and not be confined to individual laymen serving on Regional or other Committees. (*b*) A Candidate will regard participation in the Church's life within a particular congregation as a necessary prelude to offering himself for the Ministry. This is not by any means always the case now. (*c*) It is possible that a congregation's estimate of "the vicar's pet server" may be both wiser and other than the vicar's.

Yours truly,

F. C. Synge.

Fulham Palace, S.W. 6.
March 30, 1944.

CONFESSIONAL THEOLOGY AND THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Mr Jacques' admirable article raises in fact the question which sooner or later will have to be answered: What is Anglicanism? Now for good and ill Anglicanism has largely been conditioned by the

particular situation in England in the sixteenth and following centuries. Hence its critics have been able to make out a plausible case for describing it as something national and insular—as purely English as the King's Bench or the Court of Common Pleas, to use a celebrated phrase—and some of its less intelligent English admirers have been able to exalt it as a form of Christianity specially adapted to the British character and outlook, an embryonic stage of that Higher British Israelism expounded by Mr Lionel Curtis and the compilers of *Songs of Praise*. Such a description may awaken less enthusiasm in those who do not happen to be natives of Great Britain; it must surely give rise to very awkward questions on the justification for dispatching the missionaries of so peculiar an institution to the innocently un-English heathen; and, in fact, common as this type of view appears to be, it commits the serious error of attempting to define a theological confession in sociological terms. But while Anglicanism as a specific variety of the Christian faith and a splinter of Christendom—alongside its fellow-inheritors from the Middle Ages, Tridentine Romanism, Calvinism and Lutheranism—originated in the local and particular conditions of sixteenth-century England and, like these other confessions, was shaped by the sociological conditions of its origin, the fathers of Anglicanism were not attempting to manufacture a new variety of religion specially adapted for the English market; they were happily too early in time to be influenced by the heresy, latent in so many modern English minds, that the English upper middle-class temperament is the criterion of truth, and if one wanted to describe their aim in a phrase, one could say that it was the establishment within the dominions of the English sovereign of a Reformed Western Catholicism. Even in Mr Jacques' article I thought, perhaps unfairly, I perceived a whiff of the English national-religion heresy. I am thinking of the passage where he remarks that "Anglicanism may not be the faith of all the English people, it is a faith for all the English people." To be English is an accident and not the essence of Anglicanism, a fact of no more theological importance for our confession of the Christian faith than is the custom of electing Italian popes for the Roman doctrine of Papal Infallibility. I am not denying the practical importance of the national element in either case, merely asserting that it is an accident of no direct theological significance. I fancy any one of the classical Anglican divines would have been thoroughly shocked by the English religious nationalism of our time, and I think the phrase I have employed, Western Reformed Catholicism, would have met with their approval. It seems to sum up their general position, as that comes out, for example, in Hooker or in Field's analysis of the nature of the Reformation. Classical Anglicanism claimed to be completely Catholic in full continuity with the past, so that the sees in these islands in communion with Canterbury were the legitimate representatives and continuing manifestation of the Church of Anselm and Scotus, of Malachi, Patrick and Augustine. This sense of continuity is no invention of the Tractarians. Again, the classical High Anglicanism was unashamedly Reformed, indeed, was sometimes called the glory and bulwark of the Reformation precisely

because it was considered the one confession which, at however heavy a cost, secured doctrinal reformation without detriment in any form to its full continuity. And however much our theological ancestors may have admired the Greek Fathers, and however much they may have felt drawn to the Orthodox East, yet they were necessarily, as we are too, completely Western, moulded and made what they were by the Western theological tradition from St Augustine of Hippo to the Schoolmen. If we agree, then, to describe Anglicanism as essentially in intention Western Reformed Catholicism, we have to ask whether this is a theologically possible concept or an illogical combination of heterogeneous ideas. If it is the latter we need not bother about Anglicanism at all; if it is the former our task is to develop this Reformed Catholicism in the circumstances of our own time. Mere theological archaism, mere admiration of our past because it is ours, is a recreation most of us have no time for in a disintegrating civilization. But the fanning of the embers of the Anglican tradition into the flame of a living theology does seem a task worth our attention. If it were attempted we might no longer have Anglican works of divinity which either simply reproduce the Tridentine doctrine of grace or the Barthian doctrine of the Scriptures. The recovery and development of the Anglican theological tradition, which in the old phrase ran from Hooker to Van Mildert, is, I think, of special importance in four departments of theology:

(1) In the doctrine of grace Hooker, while accepting the Reformed principle, *justus semper peccator*, held it in combination with a profound theology of regeneration and incorporation into the Body Mystical that did justice to man's elevation to grace and his destiny to find fulfilment in participation in the Divine Nature. With the revived influence of the Reformed theology there is a real danger that this whole doctrine of man's elevation to the supernatural life may be neglected and grace considered simply as the word of pardon. The second volume of Niebuhr's Gifford Lectures is a case perhaps in point. The onesidedness of much of the Reformed treatment is clearly admitted, and yet in the end sanctification gets little more than a verbal acknowledgment. The doctrine of justification is a department of theology where neglect of the Reformation is particularly silly and yet where an unqualified acceptance of certain Reformed tendencies must lead to an impoverished conception of the Christian life. It is precisely because of its balance that the Anglican tradition is of such value here.

(2) Again, in the doctrine of the Church, as both visible institution and mystical body, there is a real possibility of Anglican thought today being seriously corrupted by that type of Reformed ecclesiology which in fact defines the real Church as the invisible *cœtus electorum* and regards the separate local churches, congregations, as its imperfect but only possible manifestation on earth. Much of the talk common today about the *empirical Church* appears to presuppose this profoundly corrupting error, and such notions, especially if they fuse with the current theories of denominationalism, may help to favour schemes of reunion that can only end in theological disaster. Anglicanism has never accepted the denominational theory; this is the point, I take it,

of Mr Eliot's excellent observations on the difference between a Church and a society in his pamphlet on South India. The classical Anglican divines of the past did not regard their dissenting brethren as members of co-ordinate Churches, of denominations co-equally co-existing alongside an Anglican denomination, but simply as disobedient members of the one Church in England schismatically withdrawn from the communion of their lawful pastors. That in this older Anglicanism there were elements of narrowness and even of arrogance we need not deny, but it was based on a sound theological principle.

(3) "When they and their Bibles were alone together, what strange fantastical opinions soever at any time entered their heads, their use was to think the Spirit taught it them." This remark of Hooker's on the Anabaptists indicates the standing danger of all purely biblical theology conducted without the control of the living Christian tradition. In theology today we badly need a detailed treatment of the act of Faith, its objects, motives and last resolution, of the part played by the Church in faith's apprehension of the divine Word, and the Church's authority as an interpreter of that Word, with the consequent degree of indefectibility assured to it, of the nature and sources of that living tradition within which theological exposition must be conducted if it is not to be a mere atomic Biblicism. On all this there has been little done by contemporary Anglican divines, but there is much material to be investigated in their classical predecessors. One might mention, for example, the fourth book of Field's work on the Church, one of the few Anglican works of divinity which can be called systematic and not occasional. Mr Cant has commented on this occasional character of so much Anglican writing; a century ago Newman remarked on the difficulties it raised for the student in his review of Palmer's semi-classical treatise, itself another of our few systematic works of divinity.

(4) Hooker's doctrine of Church and State, which Mr Jacques seems prepared to call Erastian, is, I suppose, that when a whole society is Christian the Church, in the whole body of which the power of jurisdiction resides, can confer some portion of its jurisdiction on the civil magistrate, who conversely can confer coercive jurisdiction on the ecclesiastical power, so that the two societies, Church and State, which are distinct in nature and definition, coalesce into one Church-State. But this is only possible where there is a Christian State—a State, that is, which receives the Word of God as the Word of God and consequently recognizes itself as bound by the divine Law and the Church as possessing inalienable divinely-bestowed prerogatives. A State is not Christian because it tolerates the public profession of the Faith or is prepared to favour it on grounds of secular or moral utility. It is on this basis that Hooker can defend the Elizabethan establishment, and he explicitly recognizes that in a pre-Christian order the two societies were necessarily entirely distinct. The case of a post-Christian order did not come within the scope of his argument or even his imagination, and in consequence neither from him nor any of his compeers can we derive direct help for the theory of the relations of Church and State today. It seems generally agreed that contemporary England is a post-Christian State which has not yet become any-

thing else but which must develop from this negative into some positive condition. Some believe there will be a full return to the Christian Faith; others consider more likely the emergence of a totalitarian post-democratic State in which the animating principle might very well be some form of post-Christian moral idealism with a nationally palatable flavour—an English "positive Christianity." Whatever the development which will hereafter appear, the classical Anglican description of the relations of Church and State no longer applies to the conditions of our time, nor indeed could it apply to any future Christian State, which if it comes, after the period of secular decay and in the social conditions of a century or two from now, would be very different from the Anglican State of the Elizabethan and Stuart times. At the most one could say that it might be the analogous realization under entirely different conditions and therefore in entirely different modes of the idea of a Church-State. It may indeed prove that the very idea of the Church-State was a temporary thing incapable of further incarnations or that the true ideal of the relations of the two societies is to be learnt less from the great Anglicans than from their Calvinist contemporaries. In any case the State Prayers of the Anglican rite are a liturgical archaism as grotesque in their utter unreality as the prayer for the Roman Emperor and army which still survives in the text of the Latin rite for Good Friday. It might be remarked also that those enthusiasts who profess belief in the divine right of kings are not continuing, still less developing, an Anglican tradition but merely indulging in the pleasure of clever silliness. There do not happen to be any kings left in whose divine right one could believe. The modern constitutional monarch, who reigns but does not govern, is a juridical entity entirely different from the anointed monarch of the past. The English fondness for the appearance of continuity at all costs has led to two entirely distinct functions being described by the same name and receiving much the same ceremonial respect. A good many years have passed since Bryce told the Americans that England had developed from a monarchy into a republic, partly democratic, partly plutocratic, which preserved all the monarchical trappings of the past. This is now generally realized even in the United States, and it must be taken as a fact in theological discussions unless we wish to be guilty of that pervertedly ingenious folly which is pardonable only in undergraduates.

Yours faithfully,
R. P. McDermott.

Ardclinis Rectory,
Carnlough, Co. Antrim.

BOOK REVIEWS

Anglican Evangelicalism. Edited by Alexander C. Zabriskie. The Church Historical Society, Philadelphia, U.S.A. $3.00.

This is a collection of essays, by lecturers of Virginia Theological Seminary and the Presiding Bishop, in honour of a former Dean of the Seminary, Dr W. E. Rollins, on his retirement. The essays, though

not so carefully co-ordinated as the editor had originally wished, all share in the quality (characteristic, we are told, of the one in whose honour they were written) of combining scholarship with a practical aliveness to the modern situation and a spiritual sensitiveness.

They fall into three groups—Historical, Theological, and Ethical—and (unlike some collections) they mostly succeed in maintaining the reader's interest throughout a very comprehensive survey of the field. They are far from partisan in spirit, and are all written from a "liberal" standpoint, in the sense that there is no obscurantism as to the Bible nor any tendency to despair of man: "The biblical view of man is as much negated by an unqualified pessimism as it is by an unreal optimism" (p. 136). But neither do they run to the opposite extreme—that "humanism" with which American theology is often associated: truly to understand the kingdom of Christ "forbids any religious trust in human progress" (p. 233). "William Temple and John Baillie and Rudolf Otto and Sören Kierkegaard, are not rivals. . . . They are all needed" (p. 141).

More specifically, the value of these essays lies in three directions. First, they underline the positive contribution which Evangelicals have to offer to the Church. There is, throughout, a healthy stress on that spiritual vitality and authentic Evangelical fervour which are necessary if the present crisis is not only to be diagnosed but met in the power of God; and there is an essay on the Bible, pointing to a non-fundamentalist reinstatement of the Scriptures. Secondly, they help to correct misapprehensions about the Evangelical Movement, showing (for instance) how grossly exaggerated the charges of bad churchmanship and social blindness have often been. As a matter of fact, there are passages which go farther than many Liberal Evangelicals in England would go in the direction of regarding episcopacy as essential. Thirdly, it is salutary that the part played by the Evangelical section of the American Episcopal Church should be brought to our notice in this country.

Few of the essays fall below the high level of excellence which (apart from some unfortunate inaccuracies) is generally maintained; and while, in the nature of the case, there cannot be a great deal which is original (this is not a series of flashy experiments) certain points of detail are striking: the Calvinism of the Evangelicals (as contrasted with Wesley's Arminianism) was due to temperament and experience rather than theology (pp. 40*ff.*); "Pelagian optimism" is not to be traced to the Hellenism of the Renaissance, but to the genuinely optimistic strain in the Christian gospel itself (p. 117, etc.); it was the Church of England which really nurtured the Evangelical Movement (p. 59). In particular—if it is not invidious to single out one essay—A. J. Mollegen's treatment of Evangelicalism and Christian Social Ethics is among the more provocative and original parts of the book and would repay careful study.

There is probably no other single book dealing with just this field in about 250 pages, and it is a timely piece of work.

C. F. D. Moule.

Cambridge.

THE WHOLENESS OF MAN. A Study in the History of Healing. By Phyllis L. Garlick. Highway Press. 6s.

This is a book of unusual interest and merit. Its theme is that the art of healing and the practice of medicine can only be seen in their true significance when they are viewed from the standpoint of the Christian revelation of the Incarnation. Thus they must not be regarded as merely auxiliary to the Church's redemptive activity in the world, but as part of that activity itself. The author contends that this is the message which the Medical Missions, specially of the Protestant Churches, address to the Church at large; and the purpose of her book is to rouse the Church to the challenge which that message brings. But this book may be read to advantage even by those who are not in complete agreement with its theological background; and in these days of widespread desolation and destructiveness it will prove a real encouragement and tonic. For the average Christian its chief interest will no doubt lie in the splendid story which it unfolds of medical missionary activity and of the developments of medical missionary policy. But all this is set in the broad context of the healing art from its beginnings in ancient Greece down to present times. One of the most interesting chapters in the book deals with the rise and decline of medical knowledge and practice in the Oriental world. The author combats "the all too frequent assumption of the occidental mind, that in extending to oriental peoples the benefits of modern medical science the enlightened West is imparting to a wholly unscientific East a system of medical knowledge and practice which in all its branches is something essentially new"; and she supplies interesting information of the discoveries made and the practices adopted in the early Hindu, Buddhist, and Chinese worlds. These promising beginnings, however, failed to develop, and the cause must be sought in the religious and philosophical conceptions of the world which came to rule. "If the lack of an active ethic and the denial of reality to the physical world have been the underlying causes for India's lack of progress in scientific medicine and the relief of suffering, worship of the past and submission to an authoritarian ethic have been responsible for a similar form of arrested development in China." Elsewhere in her book Miss Garlick quotes with effect Prof. A. N. Whitehead's judgment that the presupposition of all modern science, the rationality of the world and its law-governed order, is the fruit of the Hebrew and Christian conception of a Creator God of reason and purpose. Thus the Christian West could emerge from the scientific obscurantism of the Dark Ages, and advance along the lines of true progress. With a certain inevitability, therefore, the Christian Church with her doctrine of God the Creator, her conception of the wholeness of man derived from the Incarnation, and her compassionate ethic based on the consciousness of her redemptive mission, has everywhere led the way in the arts of healing in the non-Christian world.

There are several matters touched upon in this book which call for further thought and investigation; for example, the question of what is called spiritual healing. This is considered too much, perhaps, in its psychological aspects, and the somewhat modernist outlook of the

author in theology rather obscures from her the difference between "spiritual" healing and the "faith" healing of the gospels. The question of a possible resurgence of the latter cannot be simply excluded, though the condition of the Church today, both spiritually and theologically, does not present a favourable opportunity for raising it.

Miss Garlick also intimates, though without developing the point, the connexion between the healing art and the Christian doctrine of forgiveness. Another matter touched upon and calling for further inquiry is the social implications of healing. Altogether, we are very grateful for this book.

F. W. Camfield.

Totnes.

No Other Gospel. The Church Conflict on the Continent. By J. O. Cobham, A. G. Hebert, F. Hildebrandt, N. Micklem, A. R. Vidler, R. R. Williams. S.C.M. Press. 2s.

The Significance of the Barmen Declaration for the Œcumenical Church. With a Foreword by the Bishop of Chichester. "Theology" Occasional Papers, New Series, No. 5. S.P.C.K. 2s.

"No other Gospel"—a new and yet very old watchword, *vide* Gal. i, 19! The Christian Church will have refound her own language when she has restated her Noes. For it is strange, but true, that in all countries she has been most reluctant to say "No" at all to the errors, heresies, and falsehoods of this age. A line runs through all the Churches of today: on the one side stand numberless pious and kind Yes-men, on the other only a few unwelcome anda ustere "No"- as well as "Yes"-men.

The six sermon-writers of *No Other Gospel* have given space to the divine "No" to that spirit which wants to supersede the spirit of the Church; the culmination of their endeavour, in the opinion of the German pastors, is reached in the concluding sermon by the editor of Theology. He succeeds in testifying the "No other Gospel" to both Church and State, and disapproves the escapist slogan of the "great opportunity" that the present age is alleged to offer to Christianity. He, at least, has visualized God's unconditional "No," said to and by the Church.

In the other booklet we expect to receive the joint message of both "No" and "Yes"; for it deals with the outstanding statement of the German Confessional Church, proclaimed by her during her struggle. Comforting is indeed the bishop's introductory recollection of the fact that he called attention to the then newly-born Declaration of Barmen in the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation on June 7, 1934. But the two writers of the booklet, Principal Cobham and Dr Kramm, have not altogether succeeded in bringing home to British Christians the joint significance of the Church's "Yes" and "No" in the "Battle of Christianity." Principal Cobham presents us with a most beautiful account of the "Yes" of Barmen, of its positive Christian witness, but is profoundly worried by the negative condemnations

which accompany all its testimonies. Dr Kramm has in a bright way cast much light on some of the special problems of the Declaration, especially with respect to the œcumenical movement, but has been too much concerned with those peculiarities which are comprehensible only by the experts of German Christendom. The reader needs to be shown what simply was the real spirit of the Barmen Declaration, what simply are its real contents, and what simply will be its real effect.

The *spirit*? It is the spirit of unshaken *certainty* of "faith alone," full *power* of the "Word of God," and free *authority* of the "ancient Creeds and the Confessions of the Reformation"—the spirit of a militant Church, humiliated by her sudden call to courage *in statu confessionis*. "When these principles" (those of the Nazi invaders of the Church) "are acknowledged, then, according to all the Confessions that are valid among us, the Church ceases to be the Church." (Barmen Decl.)

The *contents*? It is marked by the double watchword "Bible and Confession," pronouncing unity between the permanent teaching of divine truth by the Church—the "Confession"—and her actual testimony to it—the "Confessing." "We confess the following truths . . . we reject the false doctrine:" both are repeated in the Declaration five times.

And the *effect*? It was the fire which has kindled the congregations all over Germany. "We are united by the Confession of the one Lord of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church." The Confessional synod of Barmen "asks all whom it concerns to return to the unity of faith, love, and hope." *Reunion through Confession.*

Not the least value of this booklet is that the Barmen Declaration has been revealed to the British Churches in an excellent translation, and everybody can realize that it does not contain any dreadful sort of doctrinal heresy-hunting. We owe a great debt to all the people of the "No other Gospel" movement in *this* country, and are sure that it will produce penetrating lessons for the whole of Christ's Church in the time to come.

HANS EHRENBERG.

SHORTER NOTICES

CHRISTIAN COUNTER-ATTACK. By Hugh Martin, Douglas Newton, H. M. Waddams, R. R. Williams. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

This is a survey of Christian resistance to Nazi tyranny in Germany and the occupied countries and among Germany's allies. It is largely a record of brave utterances by Catholic bishops and priests and by Protestant pastors. The purpose of the book is to record facts rather than to draw inferences; but it makes some observations on the effect of Christian resistance both on the morale of the oppressed countries and on the continental Christians themselves.

Such a record is both useful and encouraging. It is useful since it puts together a memorable story in Christian history. It is encouraging because it shows the fidelity and tenacity with which many European Christians have withstood a deliberate attempt, backed by ruthless

persecution on a large scale, to destroy Christianity and put a brainless devil-worship in its place. Of necessity the account is patchy and incomplete. But there is here a very remarkable volume of testimony from all parts of Europe. The reader in a country which has escaped these horrors can hardly lay the book down without some heart-searching about the strength of his own faith and the reality of his own surrender; but he will be fortified by this contemporary evidence of the abiding truth that this is the victory that overcometh the world. In more senses than one, *sanguis martyrum semen ecclesiae.*

H. BALMFORTH.

ELY.

Heritage and Destiny. By John A. Mackay. S.C.M. Press. 3s.

Dr Mackay states the thesis of his five chapters thus: "inasmuch as a sense of heritage is the chief determinant of destiny, the destiny of man is fulfilled in the sphere of history when God is chosen as his chief heritage in personal, cultural and national life." He observes that in recent history the revolt against liberal idealism has led large masses of men, in Germany, Japan, Italy and elsewhere, to seek in their racial and historical past for something to inspire a new national hope," a mystical heritage peculiarly their own which they can possess and cherish and through loyalty to which they may become strong and have the assurance of a significant future." His argument is that this "retrospective gaze" is also a distinguishing mark of Christianity, with its stress on the manifestation of the Eternal in history, and that in the historical self-revelation of God men find their true heritage and hope for the future. The thesis is explored in the story of Israel, in the life of the individual, in the life of culture and in the life of the nation.

The book is based upon courses of lectures and is uncomfortably rhetorical and even tawdry in style. Covering a great deal of ground in its 90 pages, it races from one vast theme to another, sketching now the heritage of Israel, now the Christian view of man, now the nature of culture and so on through a dozen other themes of equally formidable dimensions. But the author has real theological insight and judgment, and the journalistic manner enables him to give a crisp and stimulating quality to what others have put into larger, more thorough, and possibly duller books. This book, judiciously handled, might do well for a discussion group or study circle, especially if it is prepared to read farther.

H. BALMFORTH.

ELY.

The Cambridge Historical Journal. Vol. vii., No. 3. Cambridge University Press. 6s.

This number will be of particular interest to readers of THEOLOGY. It contains a long essay by Canon Charles Smyth, entitled "The Evangelical Movement in Perspective." He points out that the history of the Evangelical party in the Church of England has been strangely neglected, and that there is a large number of extremely interesting

questions for a future historian of the subject to investigate. Three of these, to which in particular he calls attention, are as follows: (1) What is the ancestry of the Evangelical Movement in the Church of England? (2) How did the Movement organize itself? (3) What became of it after 1833? It is evident from the documentation of this essay that Canon Smyth himself is already on the track of a great amount of material, whence the answers to these and other questions could be drawn. We do not doubt that he will be glad to hear from any readers who are able to indicate further sources of evidence. All will hope that he will be able himself to write the history of which he has here supplied a most appetizing foretaste.

A. R. V.

Christ, Youth and the Conflict of Life. A.P.C.K., Dublin. 1s.

This is the report of a conference of young members (under thirty-five) of the Church of Ireland, which was held in Dublin in October, 1943. It contains the addresses that were delivered, and a summary of the group discussions that followed each address. There were about two thousand young people present at the conference, and it appears to have been a scene of much enthusiasm. It should be of interest to Anglicans in other countries to know what is the state of mind of their fellow-churchmen in Eire, and what is the kind of instruction that they are receiving. Two of the addresses—on "Your Nation" and on "Courtship and Marriage"—are quite admirable in their definiteness, their directness, and their realism. But otherwise the report leaves an impression of theological simplification and of political naivety. The task of members of the Church of Ireland in serving Eire as Christian citizens is beset by peculiar difficulties; it requires a searching examination of the social and economic system of the country and an emancipation from moral idealism. It looks as though a strong Marxist attack on the ecclesiastical piety of the Irish might do them a world of good. But that is the case with others besides the Irish!

A. R. V.

Thy Kingdom Come. By Bernard Kelly, C.S.Sp. Burns and Oates. 9s.

The devotional study of the Holy Scriptures is undoubtedly the proper and most fruitful basis both for knowledge and growth in the spiritual life. This book has the merit that it is firmly based on the Scriptures—in fact a great deal of it is a devotional commentary, not on isolated passages but on the theme of the Kingdom of God. It is a pity that the publishers' advertisement claims too much for it by saying that within its limits it may be regarded as a complete treatment of the spiritual life. It would be hard to describe it as a comprehensive treatise. Such a treatise is needed—but this book is not it. However, if it is regarded as a series of spiritual conferences on the understanding of life lived for God according to the divine plan in the kingdom there is much in it that devout souls would find helpful to support their good intentions and direct their prayers.

GILBERT SHAW.

LONDON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: " Erasmian," *Unrest in Religion* (6s.).

A.P.C.K. (Dublin): W. B. Stanford, *A Recognised Church: the Church of Ireland in Eire* (9d.).

BROWNE AND NOLAN: E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, vol. ii (21s.).

BURNS OATES: E. Oldmeadow, *Francis Cardinal Bourne*, vol. ii (18s.).; E. Masure, *The Christian Sacrifice* (15s.); A. Bonnar, *The Catholic Doctor* (7s. 6d); C. Cary-Elwes, *The Beginning of Goodness* (3s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: E. Hayman, *Worship and the Common Life* (7s. 6d.); M. D. Petre, *Alfred Loisy* (7s. 6d.).

THE CENTENARY PRESS: Religious of C.S.M.V., *The Incarnation of the Word of God (St. Athanasius)* (5s.); N. Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom* (25s.).

THE CHALLENGE: N. E. Nicholl, *A Child's Personal Religion* (3s. 6d.).

JAMES CLARKE: Various writers, *What the Cross means to Me* (7s. 6d.).

DACRE PRESS: Ruysbroeck, *The Seven Steps of the Ladder of Spiritual Love* (3s. 6d.); Raymond Raynes, C.R., *Concerning the Priestly Life* (1s. 6d.).

A. DAKERS: E. Palmstierna, *God's Innocence* (2s. 6d.); H. Pawle, *The Seven Locks* (2s. 6d.).

EPWORTH PRESS: R. Abba, *Things Which Abide* (6s.).

EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE: A. Deane, *The World Christ Knew* (5s.); A. E. Baker, *Prophets for a Day of Judgment* (4s. 6d.).

FRIENDS OF REUNION: F. J. Western, *Church Union in South India : the Present Position* (3d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: D. M. McIntyre, *Some Notes on the Gospels* (1s. 6d.); F. F. Bruce, *Are the New Testament Documents Reliable?* (1s. 6d.).

MICHAEL JOSEPH: J. McCulloch, *The Trumpet Shall Sound* (7s. 6d.).

FROM THE AUTHOR, SUTTON RECTORY, SANDY, BEDS: Susan Miles, *War-time Commentary* (1s. 6d.).

FROM THE AUTHOR, ST SWITHUN'S RECTORY, WORCESTER: W. B. Monahan, *St Thomas Aquinas on the Sacraments* (n.p.).

FROM THE REV T. J. MORRIS (4, Walthew Avenue, Holyhead): *Cymry'r Groes:* The Youth Fellowship of the Church in Wales (n.p.).

MOWBRAYS: R. Roseveare, *Getting Married in Church* (4d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: I. B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, vol. iii—*Suttabibhanga* (10s. 6d.); L. S. Stebbing, *Men and Moral Principles* (2s.); C. W. Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office* (10s. 6d.).

PATERNOSTER PUBLICATIONS: M. de la Bedoyère, *Wanted 12 (Million) Apostles)* (3d.).

PRESS AND PUBLICATIONS BOARD: *The Paddington Estate* (1s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: *Home and Family Life* (1s.); W. A. Visser 't Hooft, *The Wretchedness and Greatness of the Church* (2s. 6d.); G. Barclay, *The Bible Speaks to Our Day* (2s. 6d.); P. B. Anderson, *People, Church and State in Modern Russia* (6s.); W. Temple, *What Christians Stand for in the Secular World* (6d.); L. E. Browne, *The Prospects of Islam* (6s.).

S.P.C.K.: G. Broomfield, *Anglican and Free Church Ministries* (6d.); J. Norman, *Handbook to the Christian Liturgy* (10s. 6d.); P. H. Osmund, *Isaac Barrow* (12s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher